

Appl. No. 10/759,249  
Response dated June 8, 2009

Reply to FOA of Jan. 6, 2009

### **REMARKS**

The January 6, 2009 Office Action finally rejected all claims pending, 1-5 and 7-11, in the application. Applicant timely responded to the Final Action on April 6, 2009. The Office issued an Advisory Action on April 22, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the enclosed amendments and remarks and issuance of a timely notice of allowance.

### **In the Claims**

#### **Claim Rejections**

All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§102 or 103 in view of Lansio et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0008640 published on January 9, 2003. For the following reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

#### **Lansio Reference**

Applicant previously described the disclosure of Lansio, thus to repeat the same herein would be somewhat redundant. Rather, it is important to only note the key aspects and differences between Lansio and Applicant's claims as recited.

Lansio discloses a system and method for improved wireless data transmission using wireless devices. Referring to the passages cited by the Examiner, namely, Lansio paragraphs [0041]-[0049], Lansio includes an adapter 420 that receives a message from a wireless device 400 intended for a name server 412. Because device 400 is wireless, it does not know its own address. Thus, in replace of an actual address, the device includes a "predetermined symbol sequence" or "self address tag" as Lansio describes it. The adapter detects that the address of the device has been replaced by the self address tag. The adapter then determines the address of the wireless device 400 in a number of disclosed methods (see e.g., [0045]-[0048]). Once the adapter has found out the address of the transmitting wireless device 400, the adapter replaces the self address tag with the address of the device and forwards the message to the name server 412.

Contrary to Lansio, Applicant's amended claims recite that the Internet Appliance includes the network portal and provides it own local information to a

Appl. No. 10/759,249  
Response dated June 8, 2009

Reply to FOA of Jan. 6, 2009

destination server. The Internet Appliance receives the message addressed to the destination server that includes the substitutable variable name. The Internet Appliance then detects the variable name and replaces the name with a particular value stored in *its* memory, thereby creating an amended message. The value corresponds to the local information of the Internet Appliance. The amended message is sent from the Internet Appliance to the destination server.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Lansio fails to teach and every element of Applicant's claims as recited. For example, Lansio fails to teach that adapter 420 includes a memory and retrieve from its own memory "at least one value representative of said Appliance local information in association with a respective variable name" as recited in Applicant's claims. Lansio does disclose several methods for determining the address of the transmitting device, but none include retrieving the address from the adapter's own memory. In fact, Lansio fails to disclose storing anything locally. Furthermore, Lansio is looking for the *transmitting device's address* and Applicant's claims recite storing and retrieving *the Internet Appliance value representative of the Appliance local information*. Furthermore, Lansio discloses replacing the self address tag with the address of the transmitting device prior to sending to the server. In contrast, Applicant's claims recite replacing the variable with the Internet Appliance local information prior to sending to the server.

Appl. No. 10/759,249  
Response dated June 8, 2009

Reply to FOA of Jan. 6, 2009

**CONCLUSION**

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUN 08 2009

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 and 103 rejections. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that amendments should be made to improve the application, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Date: June 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
Mitel Networks Corporation

By: Michelle R. Whittington, Esq.

Michelle R. Whittington, Esq.  
Corporate IP Counsel  
Reg. No. 43,844

**MITEL NETWORKS CORPORATION**  
7300 W. Boston St.  
Chandler, AZ 85226  
Direct: (480) 961-9000 x21352  
Facsimile: (480) 961-8073  
Email: michelle\_whittington@mitel.com